

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.4601 of 2016
Date of Decision:-10.3.2016.

Suraj Chopra

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA KANT
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.B. BAJANTHRI**

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

Present: Mr. Naresh Kumar, Advocate for the petitioner.

SURYA KANT, J. (ORAL)

1.) The petitioner has laid challenge to the order dated 20.11.2015 passed by Haryana Human Rights Commission (for short 'the Commission') whereby the investigating agency was directed to conduct yet another independent inquiry into the allegations made by respondent No.3 against the petitioner. It may be submitted here that before passing this order, the Investigating Officer did not find any substance in the allegations and had submitted a cancellation report in favour of the petitioner.

2.) The petitioner's case is that respondent No.3 is an employee of his landlord who is in fact the master-mind behind securing the complaint against him by respondent No.3 and that the

dispute between the petitioner (tenant) and his landlord is already sub-judice before the Civil Court.

3.) Learned counsel for the petitioner fairly states that after passing of the impugned order by the Commission, the statement of the petitioner has again been recorded by the Investigating Officer. Keeping in view the stage of fresh investigation, we do not deem it necessary to interfere with the impugned order except to observe that the Investigating Officer shall be obligated to keep in view the allegation levelled by the petitioner, namely, that he is said to be falsely implicated at the behest of his landlord. If any adverse report is submitted against the petitioner, we grant him liberty to challenge the same in accordance with law. However, if the Human Rights Commission still persists and issues fresh decision for further inquiry, we also direct the petitioner to further approach this Court.

4.) Disposed of.

(SURYA KANT)
JUDGE

(P.B. BAJANTHRI)
JUDGE

March 10, 2016.

sandeep sethi